

This is a repository copy of *Increasing value in research*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/113518/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Booth, A orcid.org/0000-0001-7138-6295 (2017) Increasing value in research. British Journal of Dermatology. p. 288. ISSN 0007-0963

<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.15131>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Increasing value in research

This issue of the *British Journal of Dermatology (BJD)* includes a comprehensive and engaging report of a systematic review of randomised controlled trials of topical herbal medicines for atopic eczema.¹ Thandar et al have complied with the PRISMA guidelines for reporting systematic reviews, as required by the BJD.² They clearly explain their focus on topical herbal medicines for atopic eczema because there is a high level of patient interest. The authors also justify the need for this systematic review in order to fill a gap in existing and on-going reviews. They state the aims of their review; provide details about their search strategy; list their inclusion and exclusion criteria and provide a table of study characteristics. The risk of bias assessments are used to inform the discussion and the conclusions are supported by the evidence presented. The only thing missing is registration of a protocol.

One of the causes of 'waste' in research is a lack of transparency in research methods, of all study designs.³ For systematic reviews, as with trials, a protocol provides details of planned methods, reducing risk of biases. Making a review protocol publically available was until recently almost impossible. Within the last five years, a number of journals have started accepting protocols for publication, and PROSPERO a free to search, free to register international prospective register of systematic reviews has been launched.⁴ Journals are now asking for the protocol registration details with submitted manuscripts in line with item 5 in the PRISMA checklist.⁵ However, providing reporting guidelines, checklists and registration facilities only helps to improve the quality of published research if they are adhered to by authors, peer reviewers, and editors.⁶

Another advantage of a single open access database of registered protocols is in helping avoid duplication.⁷ Thander et al were able to set their clearly specified research question in the context of not only existing reviews, but on-going reviews of other treatment options.

One of the disappointing findings of the Thander et al review is that sample sizes were small, ranging from 12 (participants were their own controls) to 144. This is not unusual in systematic reviewing and highlights another potential area of waste in research. There is pressure on clinicians throughout their training and as part of their ongoing professional development to undertake research. Funding for large projects in collaboration with academic colleagues is limited and the processes for research ethics and governance daunting. While it is tempting to undertake small studies, it has recently been demonstrated that few pilot studies, often a justification for a small sample size, are well reported and only 8 out of 90 pilot studies identified in an earlier review had led to a main study.⁸

Increasing value and reducing waste in research is in everyone's interests and is the responsibility of authors, editors, publishers, peer reviewers and readers.

References

1. Thandar Y, Gray A, Botha J, Anisa M. Topical Herbal Medicines for Atopic Eczema: A Systematic Review of Randomised Controlled Trials. *British Journal of Dermatology*. 2016
2. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Med* 2009; 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

3. Ioannidis, JP, Greenland, S, Hlatky, MA et al. Increasing value and reducing waste in research design, conduct, and analysis. *Lancet*. 2014; 383: 166–175
4. Booth A, Clarke M, Dooley G, Ghera D, Moher D, Petticrew M, Stewart L. The nuts and bolts of PROSPERO: an international prospective register of systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews* 2012; 1:2
5. Chien PFW, Khan KS, Siassakos D. Registration of systematic reviews: PROSPERO. *BJOG*. 2012 Jul;119(8):903-5
6. Shamseer L, Hopewell S, Altman DG, Moher D, Schulz KF. Update on the endorsement of CONSORT by high impact factor journals: a survey of journal "Instructions to Authors" in 2014. *Trials*. 2016;17(1):301.
7. Chalmers, I, Bracken, MB, Djulbegovic, B et al. How to increase value and reduce waste when research priorities are set. *Lancet*. 2014; 383: 156–165
8. Arain M, Campbell MJ, Cooper CL, Lancaster GA. What is a pilot or feasibility study? A review of current practice and editorial policy. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2010;10(1):1-7.

A. Booth (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7138-6295)

York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, YORK, UK

alison.booth@york.ac.uk

Acknowledgement

Thank you to Dr Catriona McDaid, Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3751-7620) for her critical review of this commentary.

Conflicts of interest

AB developed PROSPERO and has published and presented extensively on systematic review protocols and registration. CM has no conflicts of interest.

This is the accepted version of the following article: FULL CITE, which has been published in final form at [Link to final article]. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Wiley Self-Archiving Policy [<http://olabout.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-828039.html>].